REMARKS

In a restriction requirement dated March 9, 2004, the Examiner required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between:

Group I, claims 1-5 and 13-35, characterized by the Examiner as drawn to an apparatus that collects and identifies feedback recommendation from a user, a knowledge manager that stores and manipulates received data, and a reasoning engine that infers conclusions from the data; and

Group II, claims 6-12 and 36-39, characterized by the Examiner as drawn to a method of using an apparatus that receives, categorizes, identifies, and matches events.

The Examiner specified that both Groups belong to the same class/subclass, namely, class 705, subclass 1.

Applicants traverse the restriction requirement. Applicants submit that it is not a serious burden to search and examine all the claims together. This is evidenced by previous office actions, in which the Examiner already searched and examined all the claims together.

Furthermore the Examiner has not demonstrated a serious burden to search and examine all the claims together as required by the MPEP. (See MPEP § 803.) Classification of the claim groups into different classes and subclasses is a prima facie demonstration of serious burden. Here, however, the Examiner has classified all the claim groups in the same class and subclass, namely, class 705, subclass 1.

2

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 2, 2004 By: _____

Jeffrey A. Berkowitz
Reg. No. 36,743